

Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed on September 19, 2007, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 1, 5, 10, 13, 14, and 15 have been amended, claims 16-18 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 19-21 have been added. The claims have been amended to clarify that the plurality of inventory models comprises default configuration data for a central office in a telecommunications network, the updated inventory data comprises specific operating parameters for the inventoried equipment in the inventory management system, and that the screen scraper application program operative to intercept character-based data from a mainframe computer. The claims have further been amended to specify retrieving provisioning data for the inventoried equipment in the inventory management system from an external database, wherein the provisioning data comprises data for provisioning special service circuits, message trunks, and carrier circuits associated with the inventoried equipment in a telecommunications network. New claims 19-21 have been added to clarify that the default configuration data for a central office comprises at least one of an equipment code, an equipment location, and cabling assignments for wiring between at least two pieces of central office equipment. Support for the amended and new claims may be found on page 6, line 28 through page 7, line 1, page 9, line 27 through page 10, line 10, and page 14, lines 14-16 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cornett et al. (US 5,216,612, hereinafter “Cornett”) in view of Vogler et al. (US 6,681,990, hereinafter “Vogler”).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-18 are rejected as being unpatentable over Cornett in view of Vogler. Claims 16-18 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering the rejection of these claims as moot. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies a method of automatically updating inventory data in an inventory management system. The method includes, in a computer software application, requesting a plurality of inventory models from the inventory management system, the plurality of inventory models comprising default configuration data for a central office in a telecommunications network; selecting at least one model from the plurality of requested inventory models; generating an inventory update form for each of the plurality of inventory models in the software application program; automatically populating each inventory update form with updated inventory data in the software application program, the updated inventory data comprising specific operating parameters for the inventoried equipment in the inventory management system; and sending the updated inventory data from the software application program to the inventory management system.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Cornett and Vogler fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each and every feature specified in amended claim 1. For example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose inventory models comprising default configuration data for a central office in a telecommunications network, automatically populating each inventory update form with updated inventory data in the

software application program, or updated inventory data comprising specific operating parameters for the inventoried equipment in the inventory management system.

Cornett discusses a computer integrated maintenance system for use with a computer integrated manufacturing system which includes a computer controller for controlling production machines for producing a particular product (i.e., an assembly line). The maintenance system includes an electronically stored parts manual which contains a hierarchical listing of parts in the production machines. A maintenance schedule management subsystem interfaces with a parts manual management subsystem to identify parts in the hierarchical listing to be maintained based on a schedule of actual and planned production. See Col. 3, line 7 through Col. 4, line 18.

Cornett however, fails to disclose inventory models comprising default configuration data for a central office in a telecommunications network. In contrast, Cornett merely discusses machine parts used in the maintenance of production machines on an assembly line. Thus, Cornett is not concerned with the inventory of configuration data for a central office in a telecommunications network. Cornett further fails to disclose automatically populating each inventory update form with updated inventory data in the software application program. In contrast, Cornett at Col. 9, lines 32-55 (which is alleged to teach this feature in the Office Action) merely discusses a management subsystem designed to manage ordering and inventory of spare parts for production machines on the assembly line. The management subsystem generates orders for parts based upon a maintenance schedule. Thus, there appears to be no disclosure in Cornett of forms or automatically populating inventory update forms with updated inventory data. Cornett further fails to disclose updated inventory data comprising

specific operating parameters for the inventoried equipment in the inventory management system. As discussed above, Cornett is concerned with managing the operation of parts utilized on production machines on an assembly line and this does not disclose the inventory of specific operating parameters for inventories equipment.

Vogler, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Cornett, discusses a monitoring system which monitors the state of tagged items located within an inventory and sends an event to an event router when an item is added to or removed from the inventory. When a change in inventory is detected, a computer program determines whether replenishment of the inventory is needed. See Column 1, lines 37-44.

Vogler however, fails to disclose inventory models comprising default configuration data for a central office in a telecommunications network or updated inventory data comprising specific operating parameters for the inventoried equipment in the inventory management system. As discussed above, Vogel is concerned with generating alerts for the tracking of inventory including determining when inventory needs to be replenished. Thus, Vogler is not concerned with central office configuration data or specific operating parameters for inventoried equipment.

Based on the foregoing, amended claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2-9 depend from amended claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Amended dependent claim 5 further specifies retrieving provisioning data for the inventoried equipment in the inventory management system from an external database, wherein the provisioning data comprises data for provisioning special service

circuits, message trunks, and carrier circuits associated with the inventoried equipment in a telecommunications network. The combination of Cornett and Vogler fails to teach the aforementioned feature as neither reference discusses the provisioning of telecommunications circuits. Therefore, amended claim 5 is also allowable for at least this additional reason. Amended independent claims 10, 13, and 15 specify similar features as amended claim 1 and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 11-12 and 14 depend from amended independent claims 10 and 13 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of claims 10-15 should also be withdrawn.

New Claims

New claims 19-21 depend from amended independent claims 1, 10, and 15, and are thus allowable over the cited art of record for at least the same reasons. In addition, the new claims further specify requesting at least one of an updated equipment code, an updated equipment location, and updated cabling assignments for wiring between at least two pieces of central office equipment in the central office as well as specifying that the default configuration data for a central office comprises at least one of an equipment code, an equipment location, and cabling assignments for wiring between at least two pieces of central office equipment. Based on the discussion above, it is respectfully submitted that the cited art of record also fails to disclose these additional features.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5064

Date: March 17, 2008

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III
Reg. No. 47,299

39262

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE